



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,144	09/16/2003	Bryan D. Sheffield	TI-35286	2156

23494 7590 11/23/2005

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

KIM, DANIEL Y

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2185

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/663,144	Applicant(s) SHEFFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner Daniel Kim	Art Unit 2185	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17, line 2 discloses "the input clock strobe signal". The word "strobe" renders this limitation indefinite because only an "input clock signal" was previously recited in claim 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6, 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fischer et al (US Patent No. 5,239,639).

For claim 1, Fischer discloses a method of operating a memory at a maximum rate, comprising:

initiating a memory operation (upon request from the CPU, a state tracker notifies memory controller of a CPU read/write memory cycle request, col. 4, lines 54-56);

identifying a completion of the memory operation (the cycle length feedback value indicates the quantity of wait states necessary to complete the memory cycle, col. 3 lines 16-18 and col. 4, lines 56-62);

generating a cycle ready strobe signal upon the identified completion (the state tracker is able to generate a ready signal to the CPU at the end of the memory cycle, col. 4 lines 60-61); and

employing the cycle ready strobe signal for initiation of a next memory operation (the CPU makes read or write cycle requests of the memory controller, such cycles are initiated when the CPU sends a cycle "start" indicator to the state tracker, col. 2 lines 65-67).

For claim 2, Fischer discloses the memory operation comprises a read operation (col. 4, lines 54-56).

For claim 3, Fischer discloses the initiating a memory operation comprises:

inputting a clock strobe signal associated with a system clock signal into a memory control circuit operable to generate one or more memory control signals upon receipt of the clock strobe signal (once a cycle start indicator has been detected from the CPU, the state tracker activates a start strobe to the memory controller to start the actual memory cycle, the memory controller generates the necessary DRAM timing control signals through use of its own timing elements or integrated delay lines which are independent of the CPU clock, col. 2 lines 66-67, col. 3 lines 1-6).

For claim 4, Fischer discloses one of the control signals comprises a bit line precharge enable signal (the assertion of the row address strobe requires a precharge time delay to occur prior to the strobing of the row, col. 5 lines 18-22), and wherein generating the cycle ready strobe signal comprises activating a cycle ready circuit when the bit line precharge enable signal transition to indicate initiation of a bit line precharge operation (col. 5 lines 18-22).

For claim 5, Fischer discloses the activating the cycle ready circuit causes the cycle ready circuit to generate the cycle ready strobe signal a predetermined time after the bit line precharge enable signal transition (examples of different types of memory cycles include a read or write access, a page hit or page miss cycle, or a row miss cycle, each of these types of cycles has a deterministic number of clock pulses or wait states necessary to complete the cycle, col. 6 lines 2-7; the exact length of each cycle, i.e. the number of clock pulses or wait states necessary to complete the cycle, is predetermined, col. 6 lines 60-62).

For claim 6, Fischer discloses the predetermined time is sufficient to ensure that one or more true and complement bit line pairs substantially equalize and reach a predetermined precharge level (once the state tracker receives information from the memory controller regarding the quantity of wait states required for the memory cycle, the state tracker delays for the specified number of wait states then sends a ready signal to the CPU at the completion of the memory cycle, thus, the ready signal is sent to the CPU at the exact moment the memory cycle finishes thereby incurring no synchronization penalty, col. 7 lines 7-15).

For claim 9, Fischer discloses the employing the cycle ready strobe signal for initiation of the next memory operation comprises:

identifying the generation of the cycle ready strobe signal (the ready signal is transmitted from state tracker to CPU over a line, col. 8 lines 23-25);

modifying a multiplexer input select control signal in response thereto (external control interface state tracker, fig. 1 item 300; the state tracker monitors CPU bus cycles and initiates read/write memory access cycles when requested by the CPU, col. 4 lines 51-54);

feeding a memory multiplexer logic circuit with both the clock strobe signal and the cycle ready strobe signal (fig. 1 items 300, 510, 210, 320); and

using the modified multiplexer input select control signal to pass the cycle ready strobe signal to a memory control circuit to generate one or more memory control signals for initiating the next memory operation (fig. 1 items 300, 310, 100).

Claim 11 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

For claim 12, Fischer discloses the cycle ready strobe signal transitions to enable initiation of the next memory operation a predetermined period of time after the completion of the memory operation (col. 6 lines 60-62; once the state tracker receives information from the memory controller regarding the quantity of wait states required for the memory cycle, the state tracker delays for the specified number of wait states then sends a ready signal to the CPU at the completion of the memory cycle, col. 7 lines 7-15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer et al (US Patent No. 5,239,639) and Hovis et al (US Patent No. 6,434,082).

For claim 7 Fischer discloses the invention as per the rejection of claim 6 above. Fischer does not, however, expressly disclose the predetermined time varies with respect to at least one of voltage, temperature and process condition variations.

Hovis, however, discloses a clocked memory device in which variations in process, voltage and temperature makes it difficult to start a precharge operation at the appropriate time without introducing unwanted delay (col. 4, lines 8-11).

Fischer and Hovis are analogous art in that they are of the same field of endeavor, that is, a clocked memory device for maximizing memory performance. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that predetermined time for such an operation would vary according to variations in process, voltage or temperature because the start of a precharge operation is usually accompanied unwanted delay (col. 4, lines 8-11), as taught by Hovis.

7. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer et al (US Patent No. 5,239,639), Hovis et al (US Patent No. 6,434,082), and Sato et al (US Patent No. 5,946,251).

For claim 8 the combined teachings of Fischer and Hovis disclose the invention as described in the paragraphs above. Fischer and Hovis do not, however, expressly disclose the variation in the predetermined time correlates substantially with a variation in time for the one or more true and complement bit line pairs substantially equalize and reach the predetermined precharge level due to variations in one or more of voltage, temperature and process conditions.

Sato, however, discloses a memory with bit line precharge/equalize circuits provided corresponding to respective bit line pairs and activated upon activation of a bit line equalize instruction signal for precharging and equalizing corresponding bit line pairs to a power supply voltage level (col. 1, lines 39-44) and that a specific level precharge potential level varies according to various conditions (col. 16, lines 6-7 and col. 15, lines 59-65).

Fischer, Hovis and Sato are analogous art in that they are of the same field of endeavor, that is, a system and method for memory management. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that variation in the predetermined time correlates substantially with a variation in time for the one or more true and complement bit line pairs substantially equalize and reach the predetermined precharge level due to variations in voltage because the specific level precharge potential level is determined by factors such as the amount of current

supplied from high resistance resistive elements in a memory cell, the degree of capacitance coupling between a bit line and a base electrode node, and the relation of the threshold voltages of access transistors when a back gate bias effect is caused (col. 15 lines 59-65), as taught by Sato.

Claim 16 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 8.

8. Claims 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer et al (US Patent No. 5,239,639) and Sato et al (US Patent No. 5,946,251).

For claim 10, Fischer discloses the invention as described in the paragraphs above. Fischer does not, however, expressly disclose the identifying the completion of the memory operation comprises detecting a bit line precharge enable signal transition indicating an initiation of a bit line precharge process.

Sato, however, discloses gate circuit drives read enable signal to the active state when bit line precharge instruction signal is at an inactive state and write enable signal is at an inactive state, indicating data reading; at the time of data reading, therefore, read enable signal is activated after the bit line precharge operation is completed (col. 13, lines 37-43).

Fischer and Sato are analogous art in that they are of the same field of endeavor, that is, a system and method for memory management. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include identifying the completion of the memory operation comprises detecting a bit line precharge enable signal transition indicating an initiation of a bit line precharge process, because

therefore, when the address signal and/or write enable signal makes transitions and designates writing or reading, a bit line precharge instruction signal activation allows for the precharging of a bit line to a prescribed potential level (col. 13, lines 52-56), as taught by Sato.

Claim 13 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 10.

Claim 14 is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 6.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer et al (US Patent No. 5,239,639) and Sato et al (US Patent No. 5,946,251).

For claim 15, the combined teachings of Fischer and Sato disclose the invention as described in the paragraphs above. Hovis further discloses a clocked memory device in which variations in process, voltage and temperature makes it difficult to start a precharge operation at the appropriate time without introducing unwanted delay (col. 4, lines 8-11).

Fischer, Sato and Hovis are analogous art in that they are of the same field of endeavor, that is, a clocked memory device for maximizing memory performance. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that predetermined time for such an operation would vary according to variations in process, voltage or temperature because the start of a precharge operation is usually accompanied unwanted delay (col. 4, lines 8-11), as taught by Hovis.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiries concerning this action or earlier actions from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Kim, reachable at 571-272-2742, on Mon-Fri from 8:30am-5pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan, is also reachable at 571-272-4210.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information from published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. All questions regarding access to the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC), reachable at 866-217-9197.

DK

11-15-05

Mano Padmanabhan
11/17/05

MANO PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER